

LETTERS  
TO  
THE BRITISH NATION,  
AND TO  
THE INHABITANTS OF EVERY OTHER COUNTRY  
WHO MAY HAVE HEARD OF  
THE LATE SHAMEFUL OUTRAGES  
*Committed in this Part of the Kingdom.*

---

PART III.

---

Occasioned by the Appearance of a Pamphlet, intitled  
*'A Reply to the Rev. Dr. Priestley's Appeal to the  
Public, on the Subject of the Riots in Birmingham.'*

BEING THE JOINT PRODUCTION OF  
THE PRINCIPAL CLERGY OF THAT PLACE AND  
OF ITS VICINITY;

Having in its Title-page the Signature of the Rev. E. BURN, M.A.

---

BY THE REV. J. EDWARDS.

---

There is one publication, it is true, which perhaps it will be kind in me to recommend to your more serious and attentive perusal, and to that of all those in whose names you write, from your known passion for controversial superiority and ecclesiastical emolument; as I think you may with great advantage to your alma mater and coadjutors, employ yourself upon it during the rest of your life, provided you will undertake for once not merely to answer, but refute its arguments. It is intitled *An Appeal to the Public, &c.* not that I expect you will feel disposed to meddle any farther with this work, as we all know it may be traced to the same powerful and victorious hand under which you have already so very severely smarted.

*See the Rev. Spencer Madan's Letter to Dr. Priestley.*

---

*Birmingham,*  
PRINTED BY JOHN THOMPSON;  
AND SOLD BY J. JOHNSON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD,  
LONDON.

# LETTERS

THE BRITISH MUSEUM

LETTERS

THE BRITISH MUSEUM

LETTERS



## LETTERS.

### LETTER VII.

The resentment of a priest is implacable. No sufferings can soften, no penitence appease him.—Yet he himself, I think, upon his own system, has a multitude of offences to atone for.

JUNIUS.

MY COUNTRYMEN,

THE calamitous and untimely exit of those unfortunate paragraphs in the Reply which related to the Sunday Schools, makes it necessary for me to refer you to the beginning of that pamphlet; which otherwise it was my intention to have discussed in the first place. The miscellaneous nature of the Reply, makes it, indeed, a matter of very little importance, whether you begin at the preface, the introduction, the middle, the conclusion, or the appendix. And yet there is a circumstance which when I was criticising this performance, it was uncandid in me not to point out—Amidst all that confusion of ideas, that imbecility of sentiment, that dulness of remark, that abuse of language, that barren and unproductive effort at style, there is yet one circumstance attending it which must be allowed on all hands to exhibit the characteristic marks of the most perfect beauty. Notwithstanding the variety of the matter, and the various manner in which that matter is handled; open the book where you will, you never fail to find an uniform and continuous vein of fiction. And we have been told by allowed good judges, that uniformity with variety, constitutes beauty. Thus a vein of copper or of lead shall extend itself far and wide under every inequality

equality of surface. Thus gentle rivers wind their way, sometimes along the barren heath, sometimes they lave the foot of the mountain, glide by the rugged rock, steal along the silent grove, or water the fruitful field; sometimes they murmur through the fertile valley, grace with new beauties the luxuriant meadow, or bathe the foundations of some lofty citadel, or some busy port, but notwithstanding the diversity of the scenes through which they pass, their floods retain the nature and properties of water in every part of their progress.

This ornamental part of the work discovers itself very early indeed. The fifth sentence in the very first page of the preface, may be quoted as containing a palpable instance of this figure, which though allowed in poetry, and in some prosaic performances of the romance kind, was, I believe, never before allowed to be classical in delivering one's "*opinion on matters of fact*." It is stated that "Dr. Priestley in his Appeal, *most evidently* accuses the clergy "without *discrimination*." Now it is worth while to attend to this because it is one of those "*matters of fact*" "which fell under the writer's *own* observation;" and yet I cannot help being of opinion that he will be found to "have *presumed too much* upon the temper and discernment "of the public, in thus offering his opinion so very freely "on this fact."

By the CLERGY their champion must mean, either that whole body commonly so called, or that part of them situated in and about Birmingham. In the former of these cases, the falshood of the position will appear by adverting to the Appeal: and we shall there find that Dr. Priestley, the very first time he mentions the clergy, mentions them with the most marked discrimination possible to be made\*. So that the miserable defectiveness of that

\* "If I be asked whom I consider as my enemies, as holding principles most opposite to mine (which has been the true cause of their animosity



observation, which by way of eminence the writer styles *his own*, and that unhappy inattention to the real state of almost every case he considers, is lamentably apparent in the very first page. We may here congratulate ourselves upon the discovery of, at least, one of the heads of that Nile which we shall find, and which we, indeed, have already found, overflowing its banks, and defacing with its mire and dirt every pleasant scene in its neighbourhood. The Doctor ingenuously states that he "considers all those of the clergy, who are the avowed advocates for every thing continuing as it now is in church and state as his enemies, *all those who will oppose with their lives and fortunes every attempt at innovation.*" And on the other hand, that he is so far from considering those of the clergy who dislike this language, and who are a great number, in the light of adversaries---that he considers them as friends, engaged in the same cause, though occupying different posts.

If my reverend antagonist means by the word CLERGY, those only of them who are situated in and about the town of Birmingham, he is equally unfortunate, because equally wrong, in saying that Dr. Priestley has evidently attacked these persons without *discrimination*. I quote in evidence the following passages:—

'animosity towards me) I answer without hesitation, all those of the clergy or laity, who are the avowed advocates for every thing continuing as it now is, in church and state. Their genuine sentiments may be seen in the late *Address of the Town of Birmingham to the King*, in which they say that "they will oppose with their lives and fortunes every attempt at innovation."

'Those who dislike this language, who are a great number, even among the clergy, I am far from considering in the light of adversaries. They are friends, engaged in the same cause, though occupying different posts. We equally wish that the world, and every thing in it, should improve. We think there are things both in church and state that require reformation, and that in every country pretending to freedom, there should be full liberty to point these out, and make them the subjects of free discussion.' Preface, p. 22, 23.

'Till

‘ Till the application to parliament for the repeal of the  
 ‘ Test Act, I neither wrote nor preached, any thing that  
 ‘ had any particular relation to the principles of Dissenters,  
 ‘ and I sent my sons to the public grammar school, which  
 ‘ is conducted wholly by clergymen, and the head master  
 ‘ of which, a man of candour, as well as an excellent classical scholar, occasionally visited me.

‘ When Mr. Burn came to Birmingham, having met  
 ‘ him at a committee of the public library, I thought I  
 ‘ perceived in him great marks of liberality, and on my  
 ‘ invitation, he paid me two visits. In Mr. Madan, whom  
 ‘ I met at a committee for abolishing the Slave Trade, and  
 ‘ who was particularly civil to me there, I flattered myself  
 ‘ I had found a clergyman entirely to my mind, and one  
 ‘ with whom I might form a pleasing acquaintance. This I  
 ‘ mentioned to a particular friend, requesting that he would  
 ‘ endeavour to bring it about, as he is ready to witness if  
 ‘ called upon. This surely, did not favour of bigotry. Indeed, I have ever lived, and now live, in considerable intimacy with persons of every religious persuasion in this country, the members of the church of England not excepted, though not those residing in Birmingham. The greatest difference of opinion never led me to keep aloof from any man.

‘ Before I left Birmingham, I was happy to have begun  
 ‘ some pleasing intercourse with Dr. Parr, who had lately  
 ‘ come to reside near Warwick. We had visited each other,  
 ‘ and I am confident that the continuance of the intercourse  
 ‘ would have been a pleasing circumstance to us both,  
 ‘ though our religious principles are very different, and he  
 ‘ was an avowed opposer of the repeal of the Test Act.  
 ‘ When he dined with me, he was purposely met by Mr.  
 ‘ Berington, a catholic priest, and Mr. Galton, a quaker.  
 ‘ Mr. Porson was also of the party. I have a peculiar  
 ‘ pleasure in the society of persons of different persuasions,  
 ‘ and

‘and more instances of this are given in the *Preface to my Letters to Mr. Burn*, now published together with my *Familiar Letters to the Inhabitants of Birmingham*. Dr. Parr, however, gave great offence to the clergy, and the high church party in Birmingham, by introducing some praise of me into a sermon of his, preached at the new church before our acquaintance commenced.’

Here, my Countrymen, Dr. Priestley discriminates as far as it is in the power of words to discriminate, between the head master of the public Grammar School (who is a clergyman, and on whom he bestows the high praise of being “a man of candour and an excellent classical scholar”) and several whom it would be an insult to call his brethren. And if the just attribution of those excellencies be not to discriminate between that gentleman and some others of the clergy in and about Birmingham, there is no discriminating power in language at all. For to call any clergyman at once a man of candour and an excellent classical scholar, would be to exclude from the description the rector of St. Martin’s, the curate of St. Mary’s, the well-grown Doctor of Aston, and even the elegant and amiable preacher at the new church. Dr. Parr also who has lately condescended to brush away the contemptible insect, whose angry murmuring endeavoured to break in upon his repose, is discriminated in this passage as a gentleman of so much candour as to discover every mark of sincere friendship for Dr. Priestley, notwithstanding the difference of his persuasion both with respect to political and religious principles.

In short, I cannot discover the passage in those copies of the Appeal which I have searched. And how such a passage could creep into Mr. Burn’s copy I am at a loss to imagine. But perhaps in this case he argues from the silence of the Appeal as he did from that of the minute-book. And as logic seems to have been a branch of study entirely thrown aside, or utterly unknown in those schools,

academies, or colleges, where he received his education, we must excuse him for making such frequent use of the *argumentum ex ignorantia*. I cannot see how in this instance he can resort to the plea of misinformation, or to that sudden and deep oblivion of memory, which like the sands of Africa, or the snow of the Alps, has been found to overwhelm with the swift and unexpected destruction of that faculty, numbers at once. Nor can he screen himself under the broad oaths of the Rev. C. Curtis, the Chairman, the Nestorian wisdom of the Rev. John Ryland, nor even under the charitable and ingenious, though self-condemning apologies of his advocate the secretary.

I am well aware that a man may utter things fundamentally false, without contracting the guilt of falsifying. And from the imputation of this crime I would most willingly vindicate even Mr. Burn. And I call upon you, my Countrymen, in this instance, as my adversary did in the former, to exercise your candour. The motto affixed to the title-page of Parts I. and II. appears to have carried with it advice as needful as it was salutary. I can only excuse him to you on the score of ignorance, or the *mifformation* of his senses. And though in the former case it must be considered as somewhat presumptuous, and in the latter as somewhat foolish, or somewhat mad, to make such peremptory assertions, in cases lying open to the detection of every one; yet if Mr. Burn has not read the Appeal through and through, or if he has read it without paying proper attention to its contents, or without understanding what he read, or if his senses misinformed him, and he fancied himself reading the Appeal when he was attentively engaged in reading the History of Eli's Sons, or Junius's Letters to Horne Tooke, on one or other, or all of these grounds, I hope, my Countrymen, you will excuse him\* from any intention of harm.

\* I had almost forgot to suggest the apology our reverend champion may found, with full assurance of success, upon the shortness of his memory, and the occasional dereliction of it *in toto*.



How Mr. Burn, aided with all the penetration of the Rev. Mr. C. Curtis, all the learning of the Rev. Mr. S. Madan, and with all the shrewd and eagle-eyed sense of the Rev. Mr. J. Ryland, could commit so palpable a blunder as this, is truly astonishing. What an unaccountable oversight! For no one will believe it to have been a wilful negligence, since the falshood of the observation may be detected by every child that is able to read the Appeal\*. Notwithstanding the invincible dulness of the clerical pamphlet, I have laboured through the whole of it,

A gentleman respectable on account of his years, beloved on account of his manners, celebrated much among his acquaintance for his more than common application to the ornamental branches of science, and for his highly improved taste and accurate judgment on all subjects relative to Belle Lettres, but still more on account of the undeviating rectitude of his life, and his possession of the best virtues of the heart, in a letter to a friend expresses himself in the following manner:

'I return you the Answer to Dr. Priestley's Appeal; which I had not seen before.—To me it appears to bear every mark of internal weakness and conscious guilt: being full of malignity and ill-nature, without one spark of christian benevolence, or manly dignity. But its being convicted of a palpable falshood the first day of its appearance by Mr. Scholefield (although Burn may clear his own veracity, that is believing what he said to be true) has given it one mortal stroke, of which it will not soon recover. It seems however from this instance, that prejudice not only corrupts the heart, with all our moral faculties, but also impairs the memory. Else how could Mr. Curtis the chairman of the meeting, and all his associates forget a partial act which they must have triumphed in carrying at the time, and which was done only six years ago? From this specimen we have reason to expect farther detection, and what soon or later must always be the case---the impossibility of defending long a bad cause. Burn's laying the fault upon the secretary, and saying he was a Dissenter, is of a piece with a robber, or murderer, after conviction, saying he bought or borrowed the pistols of an honest man. In short, it has no connection with the fact, except in the perverted mind of a foiled Ecclesiastic.'

This passage affording several motives of consolation to Mr. Burn and his friends, I rejoice in the permission I obtained to publish it, for the solace and healing of their spirit-wounded minds.

\* Perhaps some of my readers will be gratified with the following remarks. The word clergy occurs in one and forty places; the word clergyman in eight places in the course of the Appeal, and the word clergymen only once. It may occur oftener if you take into the account those papers which were not written by Dr. Priestley; but those  
I have

and the more important parts again and again. Now to those who are not galled with the exemplary truth and temper with which the Appeal is written, the perusal of that work will afford a high degree of gratification, if it were only on account of its containing an accurate and incontrovertible account of an event which has astonished other nations, as much as it has disgraced our own.

I now come to the introduction, which is as void of insidiousness, of malignity, of falshood, and the cant of candour, moderation, friendship, morality and religion, as ———, as every other part of the pamphlet.

From the patched up nature of the style, and the discontinuity, as well as diverse manner of thought, so con-

I have not noticed in the account as making neither for nor against the present argument. The following is an index of those places :

The word <i>Clergy</i> occurs in page	No.		Page	No.
22	2		93	2
37	1		98	1
4	2		99	3
11	1		106	1
12	1		107	1
17	1		123	1
19	1		149	1
20	2		152	1
23	1	The word <i>Clergyman</i>	}	5
55	1	occurs in page		
67	1		10	1
73	2		18	1
74	3		19	1
75	4		48	1
77	1		62	1
78	2		67	1
79	2		98	1
81	1			

The word *Clergymen* occurs only once, in page 10.

In this account I have made use of that edition to which the Reply was made, namely the first.

The reader being thus directed to every place distinctly in which the Clergy are mentioned, will be able to determine for himself the truth or falshood of Mr. Burn's allegation, respecting the Doctor's indiscriminate accusation of the clergy.

spicuous

## THE BRITISH NATION.

44

spicuous throughout the whole of this sophistical piece I judge, that sometimes the sentiments of the reverend Synod make their appearance, and sometimes those of their reverend amanuensis, who is always to be considered as speaking in their name, and never without their general concurrence and approbation. As when the rain descends into a foul stream, or stagnant pool, one bubble is raised and then another, which, though not equal in size, are equally dirty and equally empty, so probably in the composition of this pamphlet, one of these reverend and learned divines raised one sophism, or pretended fact, and another a following one, but all of them will be found to be equally substantial and equally evanescent with those bubbles, which just arise on the surface, then burst, and disappear for ever.

The first sentence in the introduction could have admitted of no dispute, had it only affirmed that "Dr. Priestley now appears in a situation which peculiarly demands the attention of his fellow-citizens," without the bungling addition of the other members of the sentence; "Whatever be the difference of opinion, respecting the religious or political character of Dr. Priestley, which has hitherto prevailed in this country." Now it is that very "difference of opinion" respecting the "political and religious character" of the Doctor, which is here stated to be quite out of the question, which occasions "the situation in which the Doctor now appears *peculiarly* to demand the public attention." There are very different opinions formed of Dr. Priestley's religious character. Some say he has threatened to pull down that idol Jesus Christ; some that his doctrines will not only prevent the salvation of many souls, but will operate to the eternal destruction of all that receive them; that it would be better for him to burn his theological writings while he is upon earth, lest they should burn him in the abodes of hell. Nay, some there are who would have us believe that  
the

the Doctor is so far from being a christian, that he is not even a deist. In proof of this they affirm that he converted Silas Deane to atheism. I myself have heard him styled a pestilent *heretic* on account, I suppose, of his denying three to be one, and one to be three; but this last mentioned calumny makes him into a pestilent *atheist*.

With respect to his political character, he is represented by some as a mover of sedition, as an enemy to his sovereign, as a foe to the government, as one who wishes, for his own private purposes, to overturn the constitution, and blow up in one dreadful explosion, Church, King, Lords and Commons, quite as full of treason as he is of blasphemy, as dangerous a foe to the commonwealth, as he is to the christian religion, or to the belief of a God.—Now, on the other hand, many are of opinion with myself, that Dr. Priestley is one of the firmest believers in christianity now in existence, and that in every respect as a writer, a citizen, or the head of a family, he is one of the best friends to the constitution, government and people of Great Britain. Now, my countrymen, I affirm that this “difference of opinion,” is the very circumstance which makes it so peculiarly necessary for you to attend to the present situation of Dr. Priestley. For if he be that wretch, that abandoned profligate, that corruptor and deceiver of mankind, that pestilent heretic, or rather atheist, that turbulent member of society, that dangerous foe to our constitution, that treasonous plotter against his king and country;—in short, that avowed enemy to God and man, his adversaries represent him to be—Do his sufferings (for those are the things which, in the eye of my antagonists, render his present situation interesting to you), do his sufferings peculiarly demand the attention of you his fellow-citizens, any more than the sufferings of one of those chaste matrons who have lately been driven by the Birmingham ochlocracy from the houses of ill-fame?

My



My countrymen, I call upon this candid knot of divines, this truth-observing synod, to investigate the conduct, and certify the character of this persecuted man. I will meet this clerical combination on that ground, when and wherever they please, when they will lay aside insinuation, and that cloak of pretended regard to the sacred dictates of religion and morality, which they assume at the very instant they are violating them.

Thus the sentiment of the synod contained in this first sentence will be found as consonant to truth, as their representations of matters of fact relative to the affair of Sunday Schools.

We are then informed of another circumstance, not quite so novel as the former, and which we must have been negligent indeed in our observations, not to have known long before the publication of this extraordinary work, that, "Dr. Priestley presents himself before the tribunal of his country in the character of a sufferer." We could have derived this information with as little doubt of its authenticity, from any other source, as from the "Introduction" of the *Birmingham* clergy. The remaining part of the sentence, which celebrates the ready sympathy of Englishmen, receives no support from any instance of its exertion, either in print or out of print, by its reverend fabricators. But on the other hand, their conduct is an instance which supports in its utmost extent the remark in my motto.

The language they use, in this place, is similar in its cast to that, which, throughout this whole composition, it is their uniform endeavour to adopt. It is a mode of expression which insinuates the direct contrary of what it appears to affirm. A person after having read the remainder of the work, upon recurring again to the Introduction, would naturally conclude, some of the passages before us,

to

to be nothing but irony and banter. The phrase "presents himself in the character of a sufferer," would be looked upon as another way of affirming the Doctor to have assumed and personified that character. The expression, "Dr. Priestley is certainly right in endeavouring to avail himself of this circumstance"—would lead the reader, unacquainted with any other account than the misrepresentations, "*mis-*" "*informations*" and mistatements, which the production of the *divines* affords; to suppose that Dr. Priestley had no other circumstance of which to avail himself, than that of his sufferings. It would never be imagined, that he was a philosopher, "whose fame was conspicuous to every civilized nation in the world, who, as a theologian, a politician, and a man of perseverance in the exertions of virtue, and the improvements of science, was worthy of all praise" (I speak not in my own but in the language of others) "who had contributed, not a little, to hasten the glorious Day of universal Liberty, by his labours, by the example of his virtues, by the indignation which all Europe feels against his persecutors, and by the interest and the admiration which a misfortune has excited, that, although it may wound, cannot subdue his soul\*." I say instead of a man of whom all this may be said with the strictest regard to truth, Dr. Priestley would be considered by a person (if such a person can be supposed) ignorant of his character, as an obscure individual, who had no other way of attracting sympathy, than that of harping everlastingly on his sufferings.

I confess it is matter of surprise to me that these reverend Gentlemen should place such unlimited confidence in the justice of the nation, while they know, and are conscious, that neither themselves, nor the county, nor the representatives of the nation, have ever yet made an accurate

\* See Letter from M. Condorcet, and the Address of the Philosophical Society at Derby, to Dr. Priestley. Appeal, page 150, 179.

and impartial enquiry, into the true origin of the riots, nor the sufferings of Dr. Priestley, or any other of the unfortunate victims of those scandalous disorders—and when they themselves must be conscious that this very book, but for my own interposition, would have been published on the Monday previous to the day on which the Doctor's trial in particular, and that of several others was to come before the jury!—What jury, after perusing the collection of calumnies contained in these pages, but would have thought themselves justifiable, in bringing in a shilling, perhaps for the Doctor, and only a small part of the little they granted in the other cases?—And how can the nation, if it believes the falsehoods circulated in the pamphlet under refutation, do any justice to Dr. Priestley's sufferings, or those of any Dissenter whatever?

Then comes on the cant of sympathy, and the cant of candour—"we feel for the Doctor as an injured man!"—and then they talk of "indulgence," and of "justice," and their "consciousness of imperfection!" Hypocrisy is of all the vices the most intolerable.

Well may ye bespeak, reverend Sirs, the indulgence of your country, but do not call it the "indulgence of justice." Justice can afford you no indulgence. You will not hold yourselves up as men who can neither write nor read. It will be necessary for you to claim the benefit of your clergy, while nothing but the grossest ignorance could plead in your behalf. And instead of *justice* being indulgent to you, I am not sure whether it would not be an abuse of *mercy* to pardon the attack you have in this pamphlet made upon character.

"What Dr. Priestley has *suffered*," instead of "necessarily depriving him of the character of an honest man," fully establishes his reputation for integrity. Whether what you have *written* will answer a similar purpose, let mankind

mankind judge. Nor can I be of opinion that your situation with respect to the business in hand, can with the least justice be compared with that of Dr. Priestley. Though I will not be guilty of the inaccuracy of saying that an "*in-jury*," is "unquestionably," a "*calamity*," yet I am very sure that no recompence can be made to him for the loss he has sustained. But—he has not yet been convicted of wilful misrepresentation, nor has he been *suddenly* deprived of his *memory*, so that his *mental faculties* remain unimpaired, and his *good* name unblemished.

We are again presented with an assertion which cannot be proved, or a sentiment without foundation in experience, when we are told,—“the history of suffering, generally connects with it (the history) of the most eminent “virtues.” This must be quite evident to those who are acquainted with the martyrs, and confessors, of the gout and other fashionable distempers that might be mentioned; or who have ever had the fortitude to look into the Chronicles of the Old Bailey; so that the “public will see the “situation of the accused,” if guilty, to be similar to “the situations” in which many have been before them, nor will it be necessary to invent a new name for their crime, since it is by no means “*anomalous*.” Ingratitude, treachery, hypocrisy, and lying were prevalent in the days of David king of Israel, and by no means difficult to be found even in the time of our Saviour. There are many other names for vices, and for the different shades of the same vice. Thus, lying, is called in some circumstances, slander, defamation, calumny, in others, perjury, &c. If the clergy of Birmingham can clear themselves of all kinds of crime, in this and every other transaction, as no doubt they can, it will not matter to them “by what association their idea may hereafter be presented to the minds of Englishmen, or (if they are important enough) to the notice of Europe, so as to exhibit the detested image of a junto, degraded by their vices from the rank not of ministers



ministers only, but even of men!"—they may console themselves that many a good man has been served in a manner quite as mortifying as this, and that inspired apostles were *accounted as the offscouring of all things*—They indeed gloried in their tribulations, but the *clergy of Birmingham* seem frightened at the prospect of their *approach*.

At the bottom of the tenth page of this introduction, there is an insinuation, that, the accounts given by the Doctor and his friends are unfair;—now if that be the case, what shall we say of the accounts of the clergy!

As to "the part which the clergy as a body are known to have taken, in order to quell the riots," together with that heroic exposure of their persons which will mark their characters with more than quixotic honours;—that I shall explain to the public in its proper place. At present, I can only lament, "that these facts, were not so generally understood, as to make it so wholly unnecessary for the clergy to clear up their conduct to the satisfaction of the public." I am sorry too that "the confidence they felt in the rectitude of their conduct," was built on so slight a foundation, as to totter and fall before a book so full of *untruth* as Dr. Priestley's Appeal. It is likewise lamentable that they should lose "the satisfaction of understanding" (what was indeed never, or but for a short time the case) "that the rectitude of their conduct was universally acknowledged by their townsmen."

Even in the midst of all the candour and humility of these paragraphs, the yell of the wolf is audible through the fleece of the lamb, and the most illiberal "*rancour*" is attributed to Dr. Priestley, as well as a *criminal negligence*, and "*gross imposition upon the public*." A claim is likewise made in behalf of the clergy of Birmingham upon the Doctor's "*sense of justice*," and even "*gratitude to them*!" It would better become the clergy of Birmingham, to wipe

off their score of gratitude to Dr. Priestley, than like impudent bankrupts, to draw a bill where they know there has been *no value received*.

It might afford some satisfaction to the public, to know, whether it was the petulant preacher of the political sermon, in St. Philip's Church-yard; or the eloquent Lecturer of St. Mary's, (I flatter myself I should have discovered the Vicar of Sutton, and as to the Rector of St. Martin's without *one solemn asseveration*, I can believe he would not be guilty of any thing so religious) who manufactured the wretched, and in some instances, almost profane witticisms contained from page 13 to page 15. What has Jesus Christ to do with you, or what have you, Reverend Sirs, to do with Jesus Christ? Will you pretend to call him Lord and Christ? Will you dare to do this in words, while every student in the university, and every clergyman belonging to the established sect is obliged, in effect, to deny and renounce him? Will you insinuate that you are the friends of Dr. Priestley? And will you at the same time insinuate that Dr. Priestley is no friend of Christ? What have you, who have been foiled again and again, what have you to remark on Dr. Priestley's "view of Christ's character?" Whatever the Doctor may have said of Christ, he never made use of his name either to introduce or shield malignity and falsehood. Why have you made a charge so palpably false upon him as to say he has made a "*miserable attempt to establish an analogy between Christ's temper and his own*?" In what part of the Appeal do you find this? Dr. Priestley has been accused of threatening to dethrone Christ—this is calumny. But you actually do dethrone him. Christ is deposed by the members of your church, and on his abdicated seat is placed the KING. Jesus hath said, *call no man master on earth, for one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren*; but the clergy of the established sect acknowledge *many masters*.—*Call no man father*, saith the Saviour

viour of men, *for one is your Father which is in heaven.* But the clergy of the established church have fathers in God, and grandfathers in God. Christ is the *only head* of the CHRISTIAN CHURCH, therefore, the clergy of the established sect do not belong to the Church of Christ, for the present head of their church is George the Third, and the defender of their faith, (by the grace of God) King of Great Britain, France and Ireland.

You have seen, my Countrymen, in some measure, how far what he (the Doctor) calls "*his facts*," have turned out to be "*falsehoods*," and how far *their facts* have turned out to be *truths*. You will also soon be able to determine whether the language the Doctor holds towards those whom he deems \* his enemies, be that of just indignation, or according to the meek and charitable language of these CHRISTIAN DIVINES, "*of the most complete insolence and abuse that malignity itself could have suggested.*"

"With respect to myself and the manner of my interference in this business—I shall only say, in language such as my adversaries could not invent, though they have ingeniously adopted it; that feeling myself to be one of the individuals composing a publicly injured body, I cannot abandon that sense of dignity peculiar to that character, or not feel the superiority it gives me over the combination of injurers, and which will necessarily influence the language in which I speak of them."

I remain, my Countrymen,  
Your faithful Servant,

J. EDWARDS.

\* Not surely without reason.

---

#### ERRATUM.—PART II.

In Page 16, Line 25. *for*, in the very low state into which they have dwindled from, *read*, in the same flourishing and opulent state they were in before

most of men, for we are a free people, and we have the clergy of the established church have fathers in God, and grandfathers in God. Christ is the only head of the Christian Church; therefore, the clergy of the established church do not belong to the Church of Christ, for the present head of that church is George the Third, and the defender of their faith (by the grace of God) King of Great Britain, France and Ireland.

You have seen my Countryman in some measure, how far white (the Doctor) calls "his father" have turned out to be "black", and how far white have turned out to be black. You will also soon be able to determine whether the language the Doctor holds towards those whom he deems "his enemies" is that of just indignation, or according to the meek and charitable language of the Christian Divines, "of the way of peace and meekness, and of lowliness of mind."



With respect to the manner of my introduction into the world, I will only say in language such as my countrymen could not intend through their ears, and which they could not feel in their hearts, to be one of the individuals composing a publicly injured body, a bitter situation, but one of deeply peculiar to that situation, or not feel the indignity it gives me, even the combination of figures, and which will be the language in which I speak of

I remain, my Countryman,  
Your faithful servant,  
J. EDWARDS.



